



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,938	07/28/2003	Sang-Won Chung	LNK-0051	9098
7590 02/27/2006				
CANTOR COLBURN LLP		EXAMINER		
55 Griffin Road South		WOO, ISAAC M		
Bloomfield, CT 06002				
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2166		
DATE MAILED: 02/27/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/628,938		CHUNG, SANG-WON	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Isaac M. Woo		2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-65 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,6-10,12-14,17-19,23,27-30,32,36-39,44-47,58 and 62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-5,11,15,16,20-22,24-26,31,33-35,40-43,48-57,59-61 and 63-65 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is response to the application filed, on July 28, 2003.
2. Claims 1-65 are presented for examination.

### ***Specification***

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because:

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

### ***Claim Objections***

Art Unit: 2166

4. Claims 1-4, 13, 18, 32-40 and 62-65 are objected to because of the following informalities:

As per claim 1 recites. "files designated on a host computer" in lines 6-7, and "files designated on the host computer" in line 10. It is uncertain where the files are located. Thus, examiner interprets it as, "the files designated by a/the host computer", respectively, in claim 1. As per claims, 2, 13, 18, 32-40 and 62-65, limitation "files designated on the host computer", can be interpreted as "files designated by the host computer".

As per claim 3 recites, "and" in line 4, (i.e., "if" statement limitation in line 2 does not have result statement limitation). Should it be, -- then --?.

As per claim 4 recites, "and" in line 4, (i.e., "if" statement limitation in line 2 does not have result statement limitation). Should it be, -- then --?.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-2, 6-10, 12, 17-19, 23, 27-30, 58 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leber et al (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0233455, hereinafter, "Leber") in view of Heath et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,034, hereinafter, "Heath").

With respect to claim 1, Leber teaches distributing files and transmitting/receiving the distributed files (100, distributed file sharing system in fig. 1, fig.2, page 1, section 0001, page 7, section 0113, page 3, section 0054), Leber teaches a file distribution/transmission/reception module (i.e., File Retrieval Software Application, 135 in fig. 1, fig. 1a, page 4, sections 0066-0068) depending an application program executable (operating system application executed, page 1, section 0003) in a client computer (105, fig. 1, page 3, section 0061), (i.e., distributed file sharing system depends upon operating system program application, thus, distributed file sharing system is unable to run without operating system program application, page 3, section 0003), Leber teaches the file distribution/transmission/reception module (i.e., File Retrieval Software Application, 135 in fig. 1, fig. 1a, page 4, sections 0066-0068) receiving files designated by a host computer (i.e., server computer, 110, fig. 1, designates clients that have requested files, page 4, section 0066) from a network (i.e., 120, global computer network, internet in fig. 1, page 3, section 0054), (i.e., client 105, in fig. 2, receives the requested files designated by the server computer, in steps 215 and 220 in fig. 2, page 4, sections 0072-0073, abstract), and storing the received files (in step in 220, fig. 2, page 4, sections 0072-0073) while an application program is

Art Unit: 2166

executed (i.e., while operating system application running, page 1, section 0003) or transmitting corresponding files to another client computer (i.e., client, 105, receives requested files from other client, in step 220 in fig. 2) if the corresponding files exist, in response to another client computer's request (client, 105, requests files to other client, 115, in step 215 in fig. 2) for transmission of the files designated by the host computer (i.e. server computer, 110, fig. 1, designates client computers that have requested files, page 4, section 0066, page 4, section 0072), (page 4, sections 0071-0073). Leber discloses the file distribution/transmission/reception module (i.e., File Retrieval Software Application, 135 in fig. 1, fig. 1a, page 4, sections 0066-0068). Leber does not explicitly disclose performed in a background process of a corresponding application program execution module. However, Heath teaches performed in a background process (col. 2, lines 63-67 to col. 3, lines 1-6) of a corresponding application program execution module (i.e., launcher program performs file distribution/transmission/reception function for application program and runs in a background process of corresponding application program, col. 2, lines 52-67 to col. 3, lines 1-6, fig. 3C, col. 5, lines 30-40). Therefore, based on Leber in view of Heath, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Heath to the system of Leber in order to provide separate utility program or functional component of an operating system application of the client (col. 3, lines col. 2, lines 52-67 to col. 3, lines 1-6).

With respect to claim 2, Leber teaches the file distribution/transmission/reception module sends a request for the transmission of the files designated on the host computer to at least one client computer connected to a sub-network (i.e., client computer, 105, requests files to other client according to client list that has files sent by server (files designated by the server), 115, in step 215 in fig. 2, page 4, section 0072), and receives corresponding files from a client computer selected from among client computers, connected to the sub-network (i.e., peer client computer, page 4, section 0072), responsive to the file transmission request (i.e., client 105, receives the requested files designated by the server computer, 220 in fig. 2, page 4, sections 0072-0073, abstract ).

With respect to claim 6, Leber discloses the claimed subject matter as discussed above except in a predetermined folder. However, Heath discloses predetermined folder (i.e., packaging a catalog file received from computer (fig. 2A-B) specifies client download directory (folder) location, 320, Fig. 3A, col. 4, lines 59-67). Therefore, based on Leber in view of Heath, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Heath to the system of Leber in order to store the received file for proper execution on the client (col. 2, lines 15-24).

With respect to claim 7, Leber discloses the claimed subject matter as discussed above except updated files for the application. However, Heath discloses updated files

(i.e., new catalog files (latest component version) downloaded, 352 in fig. 3D, col. 5, lines 41-57) for the application (i.e., updated catalog file is used for application program updating, col. 2, lines 6-15). Therefore, based on Leber in view of Heath, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Heath to the system of Leber in order to update old application program (col. 2, lines 6-15).

With respect to claim 8, Leber does not explicitly disclose update execution module for updating the application program execution module using stored update files at an update time. However, Heath discloses update execution module for updating the application program execution module using stored update files (i.e., downloaded updated catalog file includes executable code to update application program, col. 1, lines 55-67 to col. 2, lines 1-5) at an update time (update application time is specified in catalog file, col. 2, lines 46-52). Therefore, based on Leber in view of Heath, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Heath to the system of Leber in order to provide efficient time management for dynamic application program deployment and updating (col. 1, lines 33-55).

With respect to claim 9, Leber discloses the claimed subject matter as discussed above except associated with an installation or execution of another application program. However, Heath discloses associated with an installation (i.e., downloaded



catalog file is used for installation of application program, col. 2, lines 6-15, col. 5, lines 41-54, col. 5, lines 61-67) or execution of another application program (Heath discloses associated with an installation, as discussed above). Therefore, based on Leber in view of Heath, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Heath to the system of Leber in order to provide dynamic application program deployment and updating (col. 1, lines 33-55).

With respect to claim 10, Leber discloses the claimed subject matter as discussed above except data files readable by the application program or other application program. However, Heath discloses data files readable by the application program (i.e., catalog file components include data files of the application program, col. 1, lines 56-67 to col. 2, lines 1-5) or other application program (Heath discloses data files readable by the application program, as discussed above). Therefore, based on Leber in view of Heath, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Heath to the system of Leber in order to provide dynamic application program deployment and updating (col. 1, lines 33-55).

With respect to claim 12, Leber discloses the file distribution/transmission/reception module checks a file transmission error for completely received files (i.e., checksum code is used for file transmission completion,

page 5, section 0076) when the application program is executed (i.e., operating system application executed, page 1, section 0003) such that a corresponding file can be re-transmitted when the corresponding file is erroneous (page 5, sections 0076-0079).

With respect to claim 17, Leber discloses the claimed subject matter as discussed above except updates information of a file transmission state and then the updated information is stored. However, Heath teaches updates information of a file transmission state and then the updated information is stored (col. 3, lines 7-20, col. 5, lines 40-54, fig. 2B, col. 4, lines 65-67 to col. 5, lines 1-13). Therefore, based on Leber in view of Heath, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Heath to the system of Leber in order to keep the updated version of application program.

With respect to claim 18, Leber does not explicitly disclose a list of files designated by the host computer is received from the host computer every time the application program is accessed. Heath discloses a list of files designated by the host computer is received from the host computer every time the application program is accessed (i.e., launcher program is defaults to run automatically for retrieving catalog files when application program executed (accessed) in col. 7, lines 50-55, fig. 6A-B). Therefore, based on Leber in view of Heath, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to utilize the

teaching of Heath to the system of Leber in order to keep the updated version of application program.

The limitation of claim 19 is rejected in the analysis of claim 6 above, and this claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claims 23 and 27-30 are rejected in the analysis of claim 12 above, and this claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitation of claim 58 is rejected in the analysis of claim 17 above, and this claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitation of claim 62 is rejected in the analysis of claim 18 above, and this claim is rejected on that basis.

7. Claims 13, 32 and 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leber et al (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0233455, hereinafter, "Leber") in view of Heath et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,034, hereinafter, "Heath") and further in view of Henry (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0182436).

With respect to claim 13, Leber the claimed subject matter as discussed above except transmission priority for client computer. However, Henry discloses files have transmission priority for client computer (i.e., file priority determination module (218 in fig. 2) is used to prioritize the files for transmission to network clients, 506-508 in fig. 5, page 4, sections 0049-0050). Therefore, based on Leber in view of Heath, and further in

Art Unit: 2166

view of Henry, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Henry to the system of Leber in view of Heath in order to provide efficient network traffic control with file transmission priority in network communication environment (page 1, sections 0003-0005).

The limitations of claims 32 and 36-39 are rejected in the analysis of claim 13 above, and this claim is rejected on that basis.

8. Claims 14 and 44-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leber et al (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0233455, hereinafter, "Leber") in view of Heath et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,034, hereinafter, "Heath") and further in view of Fanning et al (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0055920, hereinafter, "Fanning").

With respect to claim 14, Leber discloses the file distribution/transmission/reception module (100, distributed file sharing system in fig. 1, fig.2, page 1, section 0001, page 7, section 0113, page 3, section 0054) carries out offset division operation for a corresponding file on the basis of the number of client computer responsive to the file transmission request (630 in fig. 6) (i.e., any peer client computer that receives the message and actually has a copy of the requested file or part of it, it sends positive response to requesting client computer in fig. 6, page 6, sections 0099-0100), receives data of different offset areas from the responsive client

computers (635 in fig. 6, page 6, section 0101), combines items of the data of the different offset area into a single file (640 in fig. 6, page 6, section 0102) and stores the file (670 in fig. 6, page 6, section 0106). Neither Leber nor Heath explicitly disclose within a predetermined time. However, Fanning teaches the predetermined response time specified to receive files only from service providers that response within the predetermined time in Internet (page 1, sections 0015-0018, section 0033). Therefore, based on Leber in view of Heath, and further in view of Fanning, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Fanning to the system of Leber in view of Heath in order to prune the low bandwidth service provider computers to improve file transmission efficiency in peer-to-peer communication environment (page 1, sections 0011-0012).

The limitations of claims 44-47 are rejected in the analysis of claim 14 above, and this claim is rejected on that basis.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

9. Claims 3-5, 11, 15-16, 20-22, 24-26, 31, 33-35, 40-43, 48-57, 59-61 and 63-65 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 3 identifies the distinct feature that the file transmission request is sent to other client computers connected to the host computer, if no client computer connected to the sub-network is responsive to the file transmission request, then corresponding files are received from a client computer selected from among the other computers, connected to the host computer, responsive to the file transmission request. The closes prior arts, Leber et al (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0233455) and/or Heath et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,034), disclosing the file transmission request is sent to other client computers connected to the host computer, fail to suggest the claimed limitations as mentioned above in combination with other claimed elements. Claims 4-5, 20-22, 24-26, 31, 33-35, 40-43, 48, 59-61 and 63-65 further depending from claim 3 are also objected.

Claims 15 and 49-57 identify the distinct feature that the CPU occupancy ratio of the file distribution/transmission/reception module is relatively smaller than that of the application program execution module such that influence of the file distribution/transmission/reception module executed in the background process with respect to the application program execution module executed in the foreground process can be minimized. The closes prior arts, Leber et al (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0233455) and/or Heath et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,034), disclosing background processing depending upon application program, fail to suggest the claimed limitations as mentioned above in combination with other claimed elements. Claim 16 further depending from claim 15 is also objected.

***Conclusion***

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isaac M. Woo whose telephone number is (571) 272-4043. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Isaac M. Woo', with a stylized flourish at the end.

IW  
February 9, 2006